



Dean (Acad)/Guidelines for DC Meetings/2026

29-04-2026

General Guidelines for Conducting Doctoral Committee (DC) Meetings

In accordance with Clause R.12.1 of the PhD Ordinances and Regulations (applicable to 2022–23 admission onwards), it is mandatory that every research scholar appears before the Doctoral Committee (DC) at least once in every semester for progress evaluation. It is reiterated that DC meetings are to be conducted as rigorous academic review mechanisms and not treated as procedural formalities. These meetings play a critical role in ensuring the quality, direction, and timely completion of doctoral research. All Departments and PhD-offering Multidisciplinary Centres are hereby requested to ensure that DC meetings are conducted with utmost seriousness, adhering to the principles of objective, transparent, and evidence-based evaluation of research progress. The assessment must be based on clearly demonstrated scholarly contributions and measurable outcomes.

Frequency and Scheduling

- The PhD scholars must appear before the Doctoral Committee (DC) at least once in every semester.
- The meetings shall be pre-scheduled at the beginning of each semester. To avoid the clustering of multiple DC meetings within a short span, Departments and Research Supervisors are advised to plan and schedule the meetings well in advance of the semester registration dates. This will help ensure that progress assessments reflect sustained research efforts rather than last-minute submissions or short-term preparation.
- Accordingly, the DC meeting for Monsoon Semester registration shall be conducted anytime from the beginning of May to mid-July, prior to the Monsoon Semester registration date. Similarly, the DC meeting for Winter Semester registration shall be conducted during November–December, prior to the Winter Semester registration date.
- Any delay in conducting the DC meetings shall be justified in writing and shall require the approval of the Dean (Academic).

Pre-Meeting Requirements

- The scholar must submit a detailed progress report to the DC members, at least 4 to 7 days prior to the meeting.
- The report must include:
 - Work completed since the last DC
 - Clearly defined milestones achieved
 - Quantifiable outputs produced
 - Challenges faced and corrective actions taken (if any)
 - Plan of work for the next review period
- The supervisor must review and endorse the report before submission to the DC members.

Conduct of the Meeting

- The DC shall:
 - Conduct a thorough technical review of the work presented
 - Engage in critical discussions
 - Verify claims made in the report with evidence
- The scholar must deliver a presentation, followed by discussion by all DC members.

- Physical attendance of all DC members is strongly recommended. In case a DC member is away due to an unavoidable emergency situation, he/she may be permitted to join online with the approval of the HoD/ Centre Chairperson.
- All research scholars are required to be physically present at the DC meeting. Any exception on account of emergency circumstances shall require prior approval from the Dean (Academic).

Evaluation Criteria

Evaluation must be based on objective and measurable parameters, including:

- Progress relative to approved research plan
- Originality and quality of research work
- Level of independent contribution by the scholar
- Adherence to timelines
- Effort toward publications/patenting.

Mandatory Recording of Quantifiable Outputs

The DC must explicitly document measurable outputs such as:

- Number of:
 - Journal papers (submitted/accepted/published)
 - Conference papers
 - Patents filed/granted
 - Prototypes/software/models developed
- Experimental data generated (if applicable)
- Chapters completed (for thesis writing stage)
- Coursework done or other skills acquired (wherever applicable).

Action Points and Recommendations

- The DC is empowered to clearly specify:
 - Action items for the next review period
 - Revised timelines, if required
 - Any course correction in the research direction
- In case of poor performance, DC is empowered to:
 - Issue a formal warning
 - Recommend additional reviews or monitoring by the DC and suggest remedial measures.

Grading of Progress

The progress evaluation and grading must strictly reflect the actual performance:

- **Unsatisfactory**
 - No measurable progress
 - Failure to meet agreed milestones
 - Lack of effort or engagement by the scholar.
- **Satisfactory**
 - Some milestones partially achieved
 - Generation of Preliminary results/outputs
 - The Scholar shows reasonable engagement in the research work.
- **Fair**
 - Moderate progress with some tangible outputs

- **Good**
 - Consistent progress with clear, verifiable outputs.
- **Very Good / Excellent**
 - Significant progress exceeding expectations
 - High-quality outputs (e.g., journals, patents etc.).

Handling Unsatisfactory Progress

- If a scholar is graded Unsatisfactory:
 - A follow-up DC meeting must be scheduled within two months
 - Specific deficiencies must be documented.
- Repeated unsatisfactory performance for the second time shall be reported to the Dean (Academic).

Documentation and Record Keeping

- Minutes of the DC meeting must include:
 - Date and attendance
 - Summary of discussion
 - Details of quantifiable outputs from the research work
 - Grade awarded after progress evaluation
 - Action points for the scholar
- Minutes must be:
 - Signed by all DC members
 - Kept with the supervisor for future ready reference

Special Considerations

- Early-stage scholars (first two or three DC meetings) may be evaluated with emphasis on:
 - Performance in course work and comprehensive examination.
 - Literature review depth and Research gap.
 - Problem formulation with clear deliverables.
 - Research methodology development.

All concerned are requested to comply with the above guidelines.


29.04.2026

Prof. A.V. Babu
Dean (Academic)